

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 64-67, and 69-71 are pending. Claims 1 and 64 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in paragraphs [0010], [0094], [0104] and Fig. 1 of the present application. For example, the remote data processing and storage device illustrated at 12 and 18 in Fig. 1 and also referred to as a "belt-top" in the specification is described in paragraphs [0010] and [0104] as being configured to determine whether the data exchange infrastructure device is configured for individual use or collaborative concurrent use. To do so, the remote data processing and storage device connects to the interface that manages the data exchange infrastructure device. As is further described in paragraphs [0094] and [0104], once connected to the interface that manages the selected data exchange infrastructure device, the remote data processing and storage device is configured to select sharing models to be used separately or simultaneously to manage and enforce the collaborative concurrent use of the selected data exchange infrastructure device.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9, 11-12, 64-67, 69, and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowlin and further in view of Baek. Claims 10 and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowlin and further in view of Baek and further in view of Mangalik. By the present amendment, both of the independent claims (claims 1 and 64) have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the remote data processing and storage device is “configured to determine whether said data exchange infrastructure device is configured for individual use by said remote data processing and storage device or collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote data processing and storage devices.” Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the remote data processing and storage device is “configured to select sharing models to be used separately or simultaneously by said remote data processing and storage device to manage and enforce said collaborative concurrent use of at least

one data exchange infrastructure device.”

In regards to claim 1, the Office Action acknowledges that Nowlin does not explicitly disclose at least one data exchange infrastructure device is selectively configured for individual use by the remote data processing and storage device or for collaborative concurrent use by multiple remote data processing and storage devices. The Office Action asserts that Baek discloses this missing element and concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Nowlin with the teachings of Baek in order to provide a remote user terminal with sharing control of another terminal's application and display.

Baek recites a method for sharing a display and an application on a mobile terminal made possible to a remote terminal concurrently, and thus a collaborative concurrent use is selectively configured. However, Baek fails to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 1, as amended. Specifically, Baek fails to teach or suggest that the remote data processing and storage device is configured to select sharing models to be used separately or simultaneously by the remote data processing and storage device to manage and enforce the collaborative concurrent use of at least one data exchange infrastructure device. Instead, Baek discloses that the sharing capabilities available to a sharing presenter are limited to the applications made available on the sharing presenter's desktop (see ¶¶ [0005-0006]; [0036]; and [0038] of Baek). For example, Baek limits a sharing presenter to allow sharing participants access to one application present on the sharing presenter's desktop, multiple applications present on a sharing presenter's desktop or no access to applications available on a sharing presenter's desktop (see ¶ [0005] of Baek).

Since Baek simply discloses that the sharing presenter can limit the access that a sharing participant has to those applications located on a sharing presenter's desktop, sharing models are not even mentioned in Baek. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the remote data processing and storage device is configured to select sharing models to be used separately or simultaneously by the remote data processing and storage device to manage and enforce the collaborative concurrent use of at least one data exchange infrastructure device. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited references, including Mangalik, which also fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Nowlin and Baek.

Serial No. 10/761,733  
Docket : LUM 0001 PA/38066.1

Independent claim 64 also recites the utilization of sharing models to be used separately or simultaneously to manage and enforce the level of collaborative use of a data exchange infrastructure device. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed above, it is submitted claim 64 is also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-10 and 11-12 depend on independent claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claim for which they depend. Similarly, claims 65-67, 69-71 depend on independent claim 64 and are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claim for which they depend.

### CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the above claims represent allowable subject matter. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By /James E. Beyer/  
James E. Beyer  
Registration No. 39,564

One Dayton Centre  
One South Main Street, Suite 1300  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023  
Telephone: (937) 449-6400  
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405

JEB/bj